symptomatic of our time. It is interesting to note that Kafka is the product of the decaying Hapsburg empire which, under Charles V and Phillip II, had been one of the greatest in history. He is therefore part of the same cultural world to which Rilke belonged, a poet who in life would keep a door open for death, and Italo Svevo (whose Trieste was once part of Austria), a novelist with a profound understanding of futility and aimlessness. In this world, too, psychoanalysis was born. It would seem that, as this world began to break apart, the artist was able to see the decaying interior through the wide cracks in its castle. To this same world, in a more vigorous period, Calderón belonged; he, too, was able to see life as a dream (*La vida es sueño*). One could quite easily make as interesting a parallel between *The Castle* and *Don Quixote* as Mr. Pearce has constructed for *The Castle* and *The Divine Comedy*. When one considers what has been happening all over the world in the last half century, one can understand why the art of this section of Europe has had such profound repercussions.

Mr. Flores and Mr. Swander have assembled an important group of essays on Kafka, many of which we would have read with far greater pleasure by themselves; for together they tend to neutralize each other. The book is a significant contribution, but not yet the book on Kafka we have been waiting for.

JORGE ELLIOTT

University of Chile

STYLE IN THE FRENCH NOVEL. By Stephen Ullmann. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957. vii, 272 p.

"Stylistic" studies, in the sense in which continental European and American scholars have used the term since approximately the year 1900, seem to be gaining vogue in England—which had, in this field, remained behind French and German and also Spanish and Italian scholarship. In 1953 we were given Dr. Sayce's book, *Style in French Prose*, in which the resources of expressivity in the French language were studied on the basis of passages excerpted from ten prose texts of eminent writers ranging over four centuries—ultimately an application of Bally's method which remains close to the general language, but devised by Mr. Sayce also for the purpose of characterizing individual styles of great writers. I have pointed out in *Critique* how far and why Dr. Sayce missed this latter goal.

Now Dr. Ullmann, while treating also French prose in general, attempts to do more justice to the personal style of writers by confining himself to the novel (twenty-four novels are studied) and to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; but—and this is most important for him—he studies the style of the *complete* novels in question, not excerpts, as Sayce did. On the other hand, he remains somewhat close to Sayce in that he treats, not the whole of a writer's style, but certain stylistic devices which each author has in common with his contemporaries, so that the resources of expressivity in the French literary language are also studied. The general phenomena of modern prose writing are considered in a loosely historical (historical as to date of first appearance) and also systematic order (systematic from a linguistic point of view). Thus Ullmann treats romantic lexicological innovation in the usage of terms evoking "local colour," the syntactical devices of *style indirect libre* (developed, perhaps not first, but most extensively by Flaubert), of nominal sentences (discovered by the Goncourts), of inversions (particularly in Proust), and, finally, of imagery (which includes the synaesthesia of Proust).

Professor Ullmann, as the author of the *Précis de sémantique française*, is well known for his elegant and lucid style and his capacity for exposing intricate prob-

lems in a manner accessible to the layman and at the same time enligthening for the scholar. He is always well informed about any matter he treats, courteous in the presentation of opinions with which he disagrees, and appreciative of what has been done by his predecessors; he is, moreover, skillful in pointing out the difficulties and contradictions that are implied in any particular choice of method. He strikes a fine balance between his own expository prose and the examples drawn from his writers in order to substantiate his own assertions. In addition to his linguistic expertness, he possesses a discriminating taste for literature and literary criticism, a rare combination of gifts that is indispensable for a work in which an attempt is made to bridge the gulf between linguistics and aesthetic intepretation. As a result, his book should prove interesting to professional linguists, critics, *littérateurs*, and laymen alike.

In a study that synthesizes the work of so many scholars spanning a half century, we cannot expect to find sensationally new discoveries about the devices used by writers such as Flaubert, the Goncourts, Proust, or even Sartre. Very often, however, new facets of their work are brought to light by Professor Ullmann's "new approach," which consists in examining works complete in themselves and in comparing them with other works (of the same or of other authors) so that we may evaluate the dosage of a particular device in a particular work or author and also establish the connection between this device and the purpose or meaning of the particular work. It is not irrelevant, for example, to follow the various avatars of the *style indirect libre* through the whole work of Flaubert and to ask oneself why *Madame Bovary* and *L'Éducation sentimentale* are overcrowded with this device whereas *Salammbô* is not. (The explanation given by our author, "neither the theme nor the narrative form were particularly suited to this type of reporting," however, seems to me somewhat tautological; I would suggest that, since *Salammbô* is not a novel about the elusiveness of psychological reality, Flaubert wished, here, to remain *impassible*.)

The objections that I might feel inclined to raise against Professor Ullmann's book are very few in number; indeed, they are rather warnings about what the reader should not expect to find. For example, the title might perhaps suggest that the five devices treated form a complete "stylistic system" (p. 259) on which the modern French novel would be based. Obviously this is not Professor Ullmann's assumption; otherwise he would have included many other narrative devices, such as the use of camera and cinema technique or the *monologue intérieur* ("stream of consciousness"); these are not discussed, nor is any treatment given (only a scant hint, p. 217) of the invasion of poetry into the novel (or of the scientific style). Indeed, the reader familiar with the English and American novelists of the last half century, who have brought into being so many stylistic innovations, may feel that, in comparison, the French novelistic devices treated in our book seem relatively timid or stale (and indeed Professor Ullmann takes care at the end of nearly each chapter to mention the possibility of obsolescence).

Another doubt has to do with the inclusion of imagery in a work on stylistics. As Mr. Ullmann himself has pointed out, metaphors and similes are not the "dress of thought," as Dr. Johnson believed, but, more than any other formal devices, belong to what Flaubert called "la chair même de la pensée." Thus the insect imagery in a novel by Sartre is part and parcel of the content of Sartre's thinking (cf. his play *Les Mouches*); and if, in V. Hugo's *Booz endormi*, Ruth, looking up to the starry sky, thinks in terms of her daily work (*moissonneur, faucille, champ*, p. 31), this belongs to her character (the indefatigable tiller of the soil who does not understand the "negligence" of the "moissonneur de l'éternel été") and to her destiny—as if God had made possible, by a casual miracle, at the height of the summer, the rejuvenation of Booz. (I do not quite understand why Professor Ullmann

lists this passage under the heading "choice of images drawn from the personal experience of the poet"—the image is Ruth's, not Hugo's).

In reading the chapter on imagery I have asked myself also whether Mr. Ullmann does not overevaluate the presence of images in a writer's work (even if the images are "functional," that is, adapted to and corresponding with the tenor of the work of fiction). Is Giono, who calls himself "accoucheur d'images" (as well as "cuisinier," "décorateur," "chimiste"), a truly great writer because of the easy recipe he has found for presenting any action whatsoever in rural similes? Such a procedure, with its ready-made quality, can, I admit, be very striking at first glance; I myself was led, thirty years ago, to an aesthetic overevaluation of the similes of Jules Romains' "unanimistic" novels—whose technique, incidentally, has left a certain imprint in Sartre's novels; cf. passages such as "l'azur pond des avions sur leurs têtes"; "des pensées velues, pattues courent partout, sautent d'une tête à l'autre," p. 251; "cette marche collective . . . se mit à battre en elle comme un gros cœur forcé. Le cœur de tous" (p. 255). In such cases the philologist is apt to confuse the easy discernibility of a device with its aesthetic impact.

I can add very little to Mr. Ullmann's penetrating interpretations of particular passages:

Page 123. In cases where Flaubert presents, in *style indirect libre*, thoughts of Emma Bovary's, using expressions "she would never have thought of" (e.g., "des épithalames élégiaques"), I would use the term coined by the late Professor Auerbach: Flaubert has made Emma's probably hazy thoughts "sprachreif," accessible to language. *Style indirect libre* is always a clever writer's device in which he appears pseudo-objective (or, if one prefers, pseudosubjective).

Page 122 (nouns for adjectives). It is extremely interesting that Ullmann has found with the Goncourts the type *la blancheur d'une main* used particularly often with such conceptions as, precisely, *blancheur* ("Renée, disparaissait dans la vague blancheur de son peignoir"), *pâleur, transparence, nudité* (also *maigreur, pauvreté*). Since Ullmann gives no explanation of this preponderance I would suggest that the abstraction (*blancheur* instead of *blanc*) has presented itself most readily to those writers where it is truly an "abs-traction," a deprivation of the object of its concreteness, clarity, and contour (notice above "Renée disparaissait dans la *vague* blancheur").

Page 123. The type *un geste de tristesse*, although found with the Goncourts along with *la blancheur d'une main*, is to be sharply distinguished from the latter. Granting that in both cases a noun has been made to serve the purpose of an original adjective (=*geste triste*; =*main blanche*), still this new noun does not have the same hierarchical rank (or the same position) in the two phrases. In *geste de tristesse*, the noun *tristesse* continues the subordinate function of the adjective *triste*, while in *la blancheur d'une main*, the noun *blancheur* has become the central element of the phrase; here, and only here, do we have a reversal of roles: from "hand" limited by "white" to "whiteness" limited by "hand." Secondly, I am not even sure that *geste de tristesse* is best understood as a reworking of *geste triste*. Here the original noun (*geste*) represents a verbal concept, as *main* does not, and the subordinate *tristesse* has a causal (or resultative) relationship with the action implied (a relationship expressed, primarily, by nouns, not adjectives); in *un geste de tristesse* (*une expression d'horreur; un cri de terreur*) we have to do with an act performed because of, or in order to express, sadness, horror, terror. And what would be the "original adjectives" underlying *expression d'horreur, cri de terreur?* The secondary formations *horrifiée, terrifié?*

In the very copious bibliography given by Mr. Ullmann I miss the name of Hans Sperber who, in the volume *Motiv und Wort* (1918), was the first to discover the mirroring of a writer's phobias in his vocabulary (offering examples comparable

to, e.g., the metaphorical use of *dérailler* by the hater of railways, Vigny, p. 32). In the very generous appreciation Mr. Ullmann has given to my own work I would take exception only to the statement that my "fundamental position [the psychological one, the one suggested by Freud] has remained unchanged" (p. 27). Mr. Ullmann has not been able to read my "Risposta a una critica," *Convivium*, XXV (1957), 597 ff., where I admit the applicability of psychological stylistics only to writers who think in terms of the "individual genius," of an individual manner of writing, that is, to writers of the eighteenth and later centuries; in previous periods the writer (even a Dante) sought to express objective things in an objective style. Precisely the insight that "psychological stylistics" is not valid for earlier writers (Montaigne being one glaring exception) has reinforced in me another tendency which was present in my work from the beginning, that of applying to works of literary art a structural method that seeks to define their unity without recourse to the personality of the author. Indeed the article on Diderot (1948) used by Ullmann as an example for my method is the last written by me in the Freudian vein.

LEO SPITZER

The Johns Hopkins University

TARAS SHEVCHENKO AND WESTERN EUROPEAN LITERATURE. By Jurij Bojko. London: Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain, 1956. 64 p.

Jurij Bojko, dean of the faculty of Arts at the Ukrainian Free University in Munich, presents in this study a new approach to Taras Shevchenko's literary heritage and his connections with Western European literature. Before World War I, literary historians and critics stressed the national and folkloristic elements in Shevchenko's works. In contrast to the recognition given other literary works of Western Europe, his artistic achievements were overlooked or neglected. To many literary historians of the populist tradition in Ukranian literature, Shevchenko was simply a born genius. His connections with Western European literature were usually not recognized.

With the revival of Ukrainian literature during the 1920s, a new view of the poet developed. However, the Russian Communists virtually banned Ukrainian studies in the early 1930s and under the Soviet regime the students of Shevchenko's life and works have been allowed to consider him only a peasant poet, the friend of Russia, etc. Many of his ideological poems were either omitted from his works or "re-edited" by Communist censors to eliminate anti-Moscow elements.

However, the new view of Shevchenko persisted abroad among Ukrainian emigrants. In Poland Pavlo Zajcev, in numerous articles and especially in his monograph, *The Life of Taras Shevchenko*, showed the poet as a highly cultivated person with close connections with the West. When Zajcev's monograph was published in Lviv in 1939, it was confiscated directly from the printshop by Soviet occupation troops and remained unknown until 1955, when it was republished by the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Munich.

Marietta Shaginyan, of Armenian origin, in her valuable book *Taras Shevchenko* published in Moscow in 1941 (second edition, 1946), seems to have borrowed the ideas of Zajcev, whose monograph she may have obtained while visiting Lviv in 1940. She portrayed Shevchenko not only as a great artist, but as one of the most advanced men of his time.

Although Bojko's book is similar, in some respects, to those of Zajcev and